



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/613,941	07/07/2003	Robert E. Norris	1208	6794
7590 05/05/2004			EXAMINER	
	f John D. Gugliotta,	LEV, BRUCE ALLEN		
202 Delaware E 137 South Mair		ART UNIT PAPER NUM		PAPER NUMBER
Akron, OH 44308			3634	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	T	\\			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Assistant Comment	10/613,941	NORRIS, ROBERT E.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Bruce A. Lev	3634			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed  s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 J	luly 2003.				
	s action is non-final.				
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is losed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on 07 July 2003 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	) accepted or b) objected to e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). gected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	its have been received. Its have been received in Applicat Ority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date Jul 7, 2003.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/613,941

Art Unit: 3634

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Drawings**

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: **10** and **90**. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As concerns claim 1, there is an inconsistency between the language in the preamble and certain portions in the body of the claims, thereby making the scope of the claims unclear. For example, the preamble clearly indicates that the subcombination of an "escape apparatus" is being claimed. However, the body of the claim positively recites the "building", e.g., "mounted to an outward wall" and "mounted to an upper landing wall", which indicates the claims as being drawn to a combination of the "apparatus" and the "building". Therefore, the applicant is required to clarify what the claims are intended to be drawn to, i.e., either the "apparatus" alone or in combination with the "building", and to present the claims with the language which is

Application/Control Number: 10/613,941

Art Unit: 3634

consistent with the invention. The applicant should note that "adapted to be" language may be appropriate if claiming the "apparatus" alone (i.e., "adapted to be secured to").

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sternberg 6,616,396 in view of Buffaloe 5,769,593.

Sternberg sets forth an apparatus comprising a ramp platform 18; a plurality of hinges (inclusive of members 52; and a motion retarding reel 32 comprising a cable 28 and hook 37. What Sternberg does not set forth is a latch for impinging the ramp between stowed and deployed states. However, *Buffaloe teaches* the use of a latch 88 within a ramp system for impinging a ramp between stowed and deployed states. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Sternberg by incorporating a latch, as taught by Buffaloe, in order to impinging the ramp between stowed and deployed states.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sternberg in view of Buffaloe further in view of Beeman 6,009,587. Art Unit: 3634

Sternberg in view of Buffaloe set forth the apparatus, as advanced above, except for the lip edge on the ramp platform. However, Beeman teaches the use of lip edges 4 upon a ramp platform. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Sternberg in view of Buffaloe by incorporating a lip edge, as taught by Beeman, in order to resist an object from running off the side(s) of the platform during use.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruce A. Lev whose telephone number is (703) 308-7470.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2168.

1/15/04

Bruce A. Lev
Primary Examiner

Group 3600